



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,813	09/08/2003	Robert Daniel Maher III	NR015US	1127
27683	7590	08/02/2007	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2131				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/02/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/657,813	MAHER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher A. Revak	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 9/8/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marples et al, US 2003/0140142.

As per claim 1, Marples et al teaches of a system for traversing a network address translation/firewall device, having a public side and a private side, with network traffic, the network traffic passing between a device on the private side and a device on the public side; the system comprising a network processing system on the public side of the network address translation/firewall device, the network processing system operable to anchor network traffic to and from the private side of the network address translation/firewall device; and a traversal client on the private side of the network

address translation/firewall device having a secure connection with the network processing system, wherein the traversal client is operable to pass packets through the network address translation/firewall device in order to create allocations in the network address translation/firewall device to allow the network traffic to pass between the private side device and the public side device, and wherein the traversal client does not reside in the path of the traffic between the private side device and the public side device (paragraphs 7-9).

As per claim 2, Marples et al discloses wherein the anchoring by the network processing system is accomplished by substituting the address associated with the private side device with an address assigned to the network processing system (paragraph 14).

As per claim 3, it is taught by Marples et al wherein the packets sent by the traversal client through the network address translation/firewall to create allocations in the network address translation/firewall device are formed in the network processing system and sent to the traversal client over the secure connection (paragraph 13).

As per claim 4, it is disclosed by Marples et al wherein the network traffic is a voice-over-Internet Protocol session (paragraph 16).

As per claim 5, Marples et al teaches wherein the voice-over-Internet Protocol session uses SIP messaging (paragraph 16).

As per claim 6, Marples et al discloses wherein the voice-over-Internet-Protocol session includes signaling traffic separate from the bearer traffic, and wherein the

signaling traffic from the public side device is transmitted to the private side device using the traversal client and the secure connection (paragraph 16).

As per claim 7, it is taught by Marples et al wherein the private side device must register with a registrar on the public side of the network address translation/firewall device in order to receive voice-over-Internet-Protocol calls (paragraph 16).

As per claim 8, it is disclosed by Marples et al a method for traversing a network address translation/firewall device, having a public side and a private side, with bidirectional network traffic, the bidirectional network traffic passing between a device on the private side and a device on the public side; the system comprising receiving packets at a network processing system, the network processing system on the public side of the network address translation/firewall device; passing control information bound for the private side device through a traversal client, the traversal client having a secure connection with the network processing system; creating allocations in the network address translation/firewall device to allow the bidirectional network traffic through the network address translation/firewall device, the allocations created by sending a test packet from the traversal client to the network processing system through the network address translation/firewall device, wherein the traversal client does not reside in the path of the traffic between the private side device and the public side device (paragraphs 7-9).

As per claim 9, Marples et al teaches of the step of anchoring the network traffic to and from the private side of the network address translation/firewall device using the network processing system (paragraph 16).

As per claim 10, Marples et al discloses wherein the step of anchoring is accomplished by substituting the address associated with the private side device with an address assigned to the network processing system (paragraph 14).

As per claim 11, it is taught by Marples et al wherein the test packet sent by the traversal client through the network address translation/firewall to create allocations in the network address translation/firewall device are formed in the network processing system and sent to the traversal client over the secure connection (paragraph 13).

As per claim 12, it is disclosed by Marples et al wherein the traffic is a voice-over-Internet Protocol session (paragraph 16).

As per claim 13, Marples et al teaches wherein the voice-over-Interact Protocol session uses SIP messaging (paragraph 16).

As per claim 14, Marples et al discloses wherein the voice-over-Interact Protocol session includes signaling traffic separate from the bearer traffic, and wherein the signaling traffic from the public side device is transmitted to the private side device using the traversal client and the secure connection (paragraph 16).

As per claim 15, it is taught by Marples et al wherein the private side device must register with a registrar on the public side of the network address translation/firewall device in order to receive voice-over-Internet Protocol calls (paragraph 16).

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CR

July 31, 2007

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

